

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I offered President Bush, as did so many others here, immediate bipartisan support for the war on terror, but regime change in Baghdad, rather than disarming Iraq, represents a diversion from that bipartisan effort.

Not only do we have continuing concerns about Osama bin Laden, but also we have grave concerns about the looming nuclear threat from North Korea, which does have long-range missiles. This threat was deliberately hidden from this House until after our vote on Iraq.

The Korean peninsula crisis worsens by the day with Administration mismanagement and neglect heightening the far greater danger from this xenophobic, despotic regime. The Administration has a "Don't Talk, Don't Tell" policy that is steadily narrowing our options and increasing the risk of what could easily become a devastating conflict.

Just yesterday, former Defense Secretary William Perry and former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright warned that North Korea could be headed toward "serial production" of nuclear weapons.

I believe that the Administration's fixation with regime change in Baghdad is diverting precious intelligence and other resources that we need to protect American families from what is a very genuine threat. Despite its clever marketing campaign, and it has been clever indeed, attempting to link 9/11 with Saddam Hussein, as of this very moment, the Administration has not offered one shred of evidence to make that connection stick, nor has it demonstrated why Iraq represents any greater danger of attacking our families today than it did on September 10, or since the time we were supplying them aid.

Today, we have crisscrossed Iraq with weapons inspectors. It does not even pose such a threat that its next-door neighbor, Turkey, is willing to challenge it.

The Central Intelligence Agency, in reports that we forced out of the Administration, has indicated that the real threat to our families would come with an invasion to Iraq and the danger that any weapons of mass destruction might spread and affect us.

Overthrowing a single tyrant, in what many will perceive to be a crusade against Islam, will ultimately jeopardize families across America as we create a generation of terrorists. Further attacks will only reinforce those here in America, who are determined to ensure our safety by trampling our civil liberties.

Attacking Iraq is apparently the first step in implementing a dangerous new security policy that dramatically alters a half century's bipartisan reliance on containment that has served to protect us from villains as bad as Saddam Hussein. America will now attack first with preemptive strikes in what could spiral into wars without end be-

cause other countries are likely to copy our model.

Fighting wars as a first choice, not a last choice, is a formula for international anarchy, not domestic security. A quick draw may take out the occasional tyrant, but it comes at the cost of destabilizing the world, disrupting the hope for international law and order, and, ultimately, it makes all of us unsafe.

True security certainly requires a strong military and a willingness to use it. We are strong enough to conquer Iraq and others, but we must be wise enough to rely on our many other strengths to rid the world of dangers. Ultimately, imposing our will by force unites our enemies and divides our allies. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld may dismiss our major partners as "Old Europe," but many yearn for "Old America" that collectively and successfully worked to prevent and remove threats to peace and ensure the safety of our families.

This is not a choice between "war" and "appeasement." Rather, the better alternative is to isolate Saddam Hussein and unite both his neighbors and our allies behind an aggressive inspection and weapons destruction program.

We know that the real cost of war is paid in blood. But Americans are already paying for this war at the gas pump. And with so few allies, hundreds of billions of our tax dollars that could be spent on the needs of Americans will be spent abroad.

A robust debate in an elected Congress on whether war should be waged with Iraq is the sign of a strong democracy. Unfortunately, this year, that debate took place in Turkey, not here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

FREEDOM FROM FEAR

(Mr. BURNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concerns regarding domestic violence that plagues our Nation. Franklin D. Roosevelt once said there are four essential human freedoms, the last being freedom from fear.

Today there still are too many women and children who have never experienced a life free from fear. These women and children are the 1 to 4 million women who experience serious assaults by an intimate partner each year. They are the 3.3 million children who witness their mothers being abused every year. They are the 3.2 million victims of child abuse each year.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Lifetime Television and its partners for drawing attention to this most important and most persistent problem. To those women and children who are out there who are victims, please know that there are people and there are programs out there to help you become free from fear.

PLEA FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to plead for peace. Every day our great Nation moves ever closer to war with Iraq. I know many Americans believe war is unavoidable. I hope and pray that they are wrong.

It is not an easy thing to disagree with the administration at a time when hundreds of thousands of our brave men and women are poised in the Persian Gulf. I want to make it clear that I will support our troops regardless of what happens, but I cannot, in good conscience, betray the nonviolent principles on which I have worked my whole life. I cannot sit silent when I believe there is still time to use diplomacy and let the inspectors do their job.

□ 1345

While I believe that the hour is late, it is not too late to stop the rush to war. It is not too late to embrace peace. War with Iraq will not bring peace to the Middle East. It will not make the world a safer or better or more loving place. It will not end the strife and hatred that breed terror.

War does not end strife. It sows it. War does not end hatred. It feeds it. War is bloody. It is vicious, it is evil, and it is messy. War destroys the dreams, the hopes, and aspirations of people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that war is obsolete.

As a great Nation and a blessed people, we must heed the words of the spiritual: "I am going to lay my burden down, down by the riverside. I ain't gonna study war no more." For those who argue that war is a necessary evil, I say you are half right. War is evil. But it is not necessary. War cannot be a necessary evil, because nonviolence is a necessary good. The two cannot co-exist. As Americans, as human beings, as citizens of the world, as moral actors, we must embrace the good and reject the evil. To quote Ghandi: "The choice is nonviolence or nonexistence."

America's strength is not in its military might, but in our ideas. American ingenuity, freedom, and democracy have conquered the world. It is a battle we did not win with guns or tanks or missiles but with ideas, principles, and justice. We must choose our resources, Mr. Speaker, not to make bombs and guns but to solve the problems that affect all humankind. We must feed the stomach, clothe naked bodies, educate and stimulate the mind. We must use our resources to build and not to tear down, to reconcile and not to divide, to love and not to hate, to heal and not to kill. Let us, in Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s words, "take offensive action in behalf of justice to remove the conditions which breed resentment, terror and violence against our great Nation." That is a direction in which a great Nation and a proud people should move.

War is easy; but peace, peace is hard. When we hurt, when we fear, when we feel vulnerable or hopeless, it is easy to listen to what is most base within us. It is easy to divide the world into us and them, to fear them, to hate them, to fight them, to kill them. War is easy.

But peace is hard. Peace is right, it is just, and it is true. But it is not easy to love thy enemy. No, peace is hard. As my friend and mentor, Dr. King, said when he spoke about the Vietnam War: "War is not the answer. Let us not join those who shout war. These are days which demand wise restraint and calm reasonableness." He was right then and the wisdom of those words holds true today. War was not the answer then, and it is not the answer today. War is never the answer. It is not too late to stop our rush to war. Let us give peace a chance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Saddam Hussein has been and continues to be a threat to Iraq's neighbors, his own people, and to all peace-loving nations of the world. The United States and the United Nations have recognized the dangers posed by his pursuit of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. The world has wisely taken action to proactively address this threat.

The issue is not whether Saddam Hussein is a terrible dictator or whether or not he is dangerous. He clearly is. The issue is whether a preemptive war is justified now. I believe the answer is no. Iraq is neither an immediate or an imminent threat to the security of the American people. Aggressive inspections and disarmament by the United Nations with the full support of member states can be successful. We have time to work together with the international community to collectively address the threat of Iraq without resorting to war and without endorsing a policy of preemptive attack.

Following the devastation of World War II, the United States showed tremendous leadership in the world as we created international institutions and a framework of international law to prevent war and to sustain and maintain peace. We were the leaders in promoting a world where conflicts could be resolved peacefully and cooperatively. While never perfect, this system

of international institutions has been remarkably effective. I and many others around the world are shocked and dismayed by the unilateral, confrontational approach that this administration has taken in the world arena. We must recognize the consequences in the world community of our rejection of Kyoto, of the International Criminal Court, of the treaty to ban land mines, and our own withdrawal from the ABM treaty. We must be mindful about how our criticisms of the U.N. and NATO are heard throughout the world community.

We have to recognize that after 9-11, the world came together in solidarity with our loss, working with us to find the perpetrators, to break up al Qaeda and arrest its leaders, to interrupt the flow of money. It should have been crystal clear that fighting terrorism and protecting American security would require our friends and our allies; cooperation, not confrontation. Yet the administration instead engaged in a single-minded drive to achieve its Iraqi objectives at any cost instead of developing a policy to deal with Iraq by working with our allies, by working with the world community. Even if the administration gets what it wants this time, what is the long-term damage to our international relationships? How will it impact our efforts to stop terrorism and protect the security of the American people?

I am worried. The people that I represent are very anxious. It seems more and more likely that war is around the corner. What will that war be? Are the American people prepared? The American people are expecting, I think, a smaller conflict than we are walking into, perhaps a Grenada, a Panama or the first Gulf War; quick, hopefully few casualties, troops in and out within weeks or months. I think that this war would be different. After a large ground war to capture the entire country, we will likely occupy Iraq. The Army Chief of Staff, General Shinseki, estimated that we would need 100,000 troops or more for the occupation. We have no idea how long they would have to stay. Mr. President, we need to hear about your exit strategy, and we need to hear that now.

The congressional debate that we had last fall to authorize the use of force against Iraq did not prepare the American people for the ramifications of this war and what this administration truly envisions. I call on this administration to answer the myriad questions that have been posed by numerous Members of Congress on behalf of our constituencies before ground troops are committed. All of Congress and all of America stand by our troops, but we think it is absolutely incumbent upon this administration to answer our questions.

U.S.-FRENCH RELATIONS IN LIGHT OF IRAQI CONFLICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, in the current international debate on Iraq, I have the very clear impression that the United States and France are talking past each other and not listening to each other. More particularly, that the United States is not listening to the very nuanced views expressed by the French. My assessment of the dialogue is that President Chirac and President Bush are in accord on the objective of disarming Iraq of weapons of mass destruction and the capability to deliver such weapons. The Bush administration, however, has concluded that the only way to achieve this objective is through military action. In contrast, the French and many other U.S. allies and friendly observers favor continued diplomacy in the firm belief that a vigorous, intensive weapons inspection program will attain the disarmament objective.

It would be useful for the Bush administration to think more constructively about France's contributions to international dialogue and its distinguished record of multilateral peacekeeping as well as military intervention when justified.

A few highlights would be instructive: France was a valuable partner for the United States during the Gulf War in 1991, deploying 10,000 troops and 100 aircraft in Operation Desert Storm. From 1991 through 1995, France was an active ally to secure the peace in Bosnia. During this important peacekeeping mission, 70 French soldiers were killed and more than 600 wounded. In 1999, France deployed the greatest number of aircraft and flew the largest number of sorties of any combatant in Operation Allied Force in Kosovo. France today is contributing the largest contingent of peacekeepers in the Balkans, more than any other nation, including our own.

After September 11, French troops participated in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan where France continues to place its troops in harm's way to provide security in that critical region. French President Chirac was the first foreign leader to pay his respects to the United States in person following the September 11 attacks. This is a very significant record of valuable contributions that France has made where and when needed to combat terror and secure peace.

Our foreign policy would be better served by respecting the historical reality of the U.S.-French relationship. We need to listen to the wise counsel of this longstanding friend of America which has learned how to deal with the Islamic terrorist threat from its own painful experience in Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco and the large Arabic-Islamic population among its own citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a New York Times op-ed piece on this very subject.